A U M

Govern thy heart! Constrain th' entangled sense!
Resist the false, soft sinfulness which saps
Knowledge and judgment! Yea, the world is strong,
But what discerns it stronger, and the mind
Strongest; and high o'er all the ruling Soul.
Wherefore, perceiving Him who reigns supreme,
Put forth full force of Soul in thy own Soul!
Fight! Vanquish foes and doubts, dear Hero! slay
What haunts thee in fond shapes, and would betray!
—*Arnold's Bhagavad-Gita, chap. 3.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. IX **JANUARY, 1921** **No. 3**

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

GREETINGS FROM CANTERBURY

And now, my Lord Primate, we have very respectfully laid before you the principal points of difference and disagreement between Theosophy and the Christian Churches, and told you of the oneness of Theosophy and the teachings of Jesus. You have heard our profession of faith, and learned the grievances and plaints which we lay at the door of dogmatic Christianity. . . . Will you . . . venture to accord us no other recognition than the usual *anathema,* which the Church keeps in store for the reformer? Or may we hope that the bitter lessons of experience, which that policy has afforded the Churches in the past, will have altered the hearts and cleared the understandings of her rulers; and that the coming year, 1888, will witness the stretching out to us of the hands of Christians in fellowship and good will?

—"LUCIFER" to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Greeting.*

MY LORD PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND,—

We make use of an open letter to your Grace as a vehicle to convey to you, and through you, to the clergy, to their flocks, and to Christians generally—who regard us as the enemies of Christ—a brief statement of the position which Theosophy occupies in regard to Christianity, as we believe that the time for making that statement has arrived.

With the foregoing paragraph, *Lucifer* for December, 1887, commenced a wonderful, a thrilling, and a vital communication to the Head of the Anglican communion, familiarly known in America as the "Episcopal" Church, *i. e.,* the Church of the Bishops. Its

*Reprinted in full in THEOSOPHY for February, 1913.

closing summation and appeal we have used for our text. The final sentence in the article read: And now, if your Grace can prove that we do injustice to the Church of which you are the Head, or to popular Theology, we promise to acknowledge our error publicly. But—"SILENCE GIVES CONSENT."

The Archbishop of Canterbury remained silent for more than twenty-one years. But the leaven has been working all these years and now it is the duty and the pleasure of the lovers of Theosophy and of H. P. Blavatsky to recognize what may fitly be termed Greetings *from* the Archbishop of Canterbury. An historical word may appropriately prelude the matter and the comments to which we invite the thoughtful consideration of the readers of this magazine.

The Sixth decennial "Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion" was "holden at Lambeth Palace" in July and August of the year just closed. The "Lambeth Conference," as it has come to be called, is neither an official Synod nor confined exclusively to the Bishops of the Church of England. It is a Pan-Anglican synod or conference in an unauthoritative sense, to which Bishops of the Episcopal faith in other lands come in large numbers, and even Dignitaries of other Protestant communions from time to time. The first Conference was held at Lambeth Palace, the London residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1867. Seventy-six Bishops attended; almost as many more refused to attend, and the sessions were private, marked by timidity and uncertainty. No reports were rendered by the various Committees, but another Conference was arranged for a decade later. Its conclusions, resolutions and recommendations were subsequently made public in the form of an encyclical letter. Almost exclusively Church matters were considered.

The Third Conference was held in the summer of 1888, and it was in view of this forthcoming Conference that *Lucifer's* famous editorial was written. That Conference greatly widened the scope of its discussions and, in fact, took action in the form of reports and resolutions on many of the questions raised by H. P. B., but, in its dignity, took, of course, no notice of Theosophy. It did, however, take a broad and generous stand in the direction of a basis for "home reunion" of Protestant Churches. The Fourth and Fifth Conferences, in 1897 and 1908, carried on the principle of the wider vision and their resolutions were successive forward steps, one even speaking in tolerance and moderation of "ministries of healing"—that is, of Christian Science and allied practices since known under the term of the Emmanuel Movement.

But the recent Lambeth Conference goes much further than any or all of its predecessors and some of its resolutions constitute not only a veritable admission of the "grievances and plaints" of *Lucifer,* but as well what generous minded Theosophists will hail as

a recognition of Theosophy in no narrow or invidious spirit, and almost, in very point of fact, "a stretching out to us of the hands of Christians in fellowship and good will." The Conference was attended by 252 Bishops from all parts of the world—a larger number and representative of a greater diversity than any previous synod. But to the conclusions of the "Lambeth Conference" upon matters of Theosophical moment:

"We recognize that modern movements of thought connected with Spiritualism, Christian Science and Theosophy join with the Christian Church in protesting against a materialistic view of the universe and at some points emphasize partially neglected aspects of truth. . .

"We recognize that new phenomena of consciousness have been presented to us which claim, and at the hands of competent psychologists and as far as possible, the application of scientific method. . . .

"The Conference, while prepared to expect and welcome new light from psychical research upon the powers and processes of the spirit of man, urges strongly that a larger place should be given in the teachings of the Church to the explanation of the true grounds of Christian belief in eternal life, and in immortality, and of the true content of belief in the Communion of Saints as involving real fellowship with the departed through the love of God in Christ Jesus.

"The Conference, while recognizing that the three publicly stated objects of the Theosophical Society do not in themselves appear to be inconsistent with loyal membership of the Church, desires to express its conviction there are cardinal elements in the positive teaching current in theosophical circles and literature which are irreconcilable with the Christian faith as to the person and mission of Christ and with the missionary claim and duty of the Christian religion as the message of God to all mankind. The Conference warns Christian people, who may be induced to make a study of Theosophy by the seemingly Christian elements contained in it, to be on their guard against the ultimate bearing of Theosophical teaching, and urges them to examine strictly the character and credentials of the teachers upon whose authority they are encouraged or compelled to rely.

"The Conference, believing that the attraction of Theosophy lies largely in its presentation of Christian faith as a quest for knowledge, recommends that in the current teaching of the Church due regard should be given to the mystical elements of faith and life which underlie the historic belief of Christendom, and on the other hand urges all thinking people to safeguard their Christian position by a fuller study of the Bible, creed and sacraments in the light of sound Christian scholarship and philosophy."

Other significant admissions and statements are made: That men "form fellowships, that they may do outside the Church what

they ought to have had the opportunity to do, and to do better, within it;" "we cannot but sympathize with persons who seek a refuge from the pressure of materialism. It is the part of the Church to afford such refuge, and if it fails to do so, there is something wrong with its own life;" "we are supported by the best psychologists in warning our people against accepting as final, theories which further knowledge may disprove, and still more against the indiscriminate and undisciplined exercise of psychic powers, and the habit of recourse to seances, 'seers,' and mediums."

Thoughtful Theosophists will, we think, recognize that the note of warning sounded by the Conference on "psychic research" is as applicable to ourselves as to any others, for certainly all too many theosophical students and enquirers still confound astralism and mediumship with Theosophy and true Occultism. And let us be at least as open-minded as these Church dignitaries; let us admit that we too, as much as any, *do,* indeed, need "to be on our guard against the ultimate bearing" of much that nowadays circulates as "theosophical teaching," and that Theosophists of to-day in many quarters have a dire occasion to "examine strictly the character and credentials of the teachers upon whose authority they are encouraged or compelled to rely." And, yet again, Theosophists as well as Bishops and Church people generally, are prone to "safeguard their position" by a "fuller study of their Bible,—in the light of sound scholarship and philosophy—*as they think;* but which in fact, if scrutinized, means that they are accustomed to study the Source of their faith in the light of the interpretations and opinions of their "leaders." This is the bane of human nature. Let Christians study their Bishops and their Bishops' teachings *in the light of the sayings and the life of Jesus!* Let Theosophists study the characters, claims and credentials of *their* "Bishops" *in the light of the life and teachings of H. P. B.*

For the rest the "Lambeth Conference" has in it much that is of the nature both of a portent and a promise.

FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

. . . The ever unknowable and incognizable *Karana* alone, the *Causeless* Cause of all causes, should have its shrine and altar on the holy and ever untrodden ground of our heart—invisible, intangible, unmentioned, save through "the still small voice" of our spiritual consciousness. Those who worship before it, ought to do so in the silence and the sanctified solitude of their Souls; making their spirit the sole mediator between them and the *Universal Spirit,* their good actions the only priests, and their sinful intentions the only visible and objective sacrificial victims to the *Presence.*

*From the Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 280; see Third Edition, Vol. I, p. p. 300-301.

PLANETARY INFLUENCES*

THE philosophy of Theosophy covers all things in manifestation and points out the relations of each thing to every other. Our personal purview extends over our own interests, over our religion, or our system of thought, or our ideas, and moving along those lines within narrow limits, we finally reach the place where we are living entirely for ourselves, making use of all the efforts, thoughts, and ideas of others solely that we ourselves may benefit by them. We need to raise our eyes and our minds to the greater view of what the great universe itself is.

This Earth is a planet, as we all know. But there are also other planets quite as likely to be inhabited as is this planet. So, too, this solar system of ours is but one of innumerable solar systems in the universe. All are parts of the vast whole; all are consequently related. There was a time when the knowledge of these relationships existed—when they were taught in the ancient temples as part of the Great Initiation. That was the true Astrology, but not the Astrology of the present day, which has lost the ancient knowledge just as the true meaning of religion has become lost in the course of time. And just as there are some sorry remnants of religious knowledge in the world to-day, so the remnants of astrological knowledge are almost entirely applied to the personality in physical life, considering with chart and table effects of planetary influence merely upon the physical affairs of men. The physical is but one line of effect, and the only line, if we believe planets to be mere physical embodiments. But there are other sides to the nature of planets, and these we must understand, if we are to get any true idea of planetary influence.

All beings and all forms of every kind are constituted of many different "principles". For instance, connected with man himself there is his body; there is the mind that he uses; there are powers which he exercises; and there is himself—the perceiver, the knower, the experiencer, who through his mind, his powers, his body learns. It is apparent, then, that there are other departments of our body than the physical to be affected by any influence; and, if there is a physical effect of planetary influence, as there must of necessity be, we shall have to inquire also into its effect upon *all* these departments of our nature.

Not only is man constituted of seven distinct principles, but also all planets are septenary in their natures. There is a spiritual "something," a psychic "something," an intellectual "something," an astral "something," and a physical "something," in every planet. Planets are not merely physical things, any more than we as human beings are merely bodies. There are beings of various classes which

*From the stenographic report of a talk by Robert Crosbie. Here published for the first time —EDITORS.

constitute the planet and its inhabitants, just as this planet is constituted of the various beings belonging to the four kingdoms, from which it derives its own peculiar influence. Let us, then, consider something of the nature of these planets with which we are most intimately connected, if we would gain any idea as to the real meaning of planetary influence.

The Sun is the life-giver of our particular solar system. The Sun shines on all the planets, but the effects received differ for each planet according to the conditions presented. The Sun is the central store of our system and the focus for physical life, but it has also other constituents which apply to our intellectual or psychic, astral and spiritual constituents. At one and the same time, we might say that it is the giver of life physical and life spiritual, if we understand that we are not speaking of the mere physical Sun, which is, correspondentially, just what our bodies are, only that principle of it which we perceive objectively. Yet all the other principles are there, their influence flowing out upon us; from them we get whatever we are able to take. So we see there is not only a direct influence of the Sun on the Earth itself, but also upon us as peoples of it.

The Moon, the nearest planet to us, influences us physically, astrally and psychically, for of like nature are the forces in the Moon. Even the phases of the Moon have their particular influence upon us, as noted in the case of "lunatics," who are rendered more insane at certain phases. The Moon's influence is observable also in the lower kingdoms—the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal, as well as on ourselves—self-conscious beings.

Other planets still nearer to the Sun, as Mercury, for example, have still greater influence. Mercury receives seven times as much light from the Sun as the Earth, and has seven times as much—other things. Venus, standing next in order of nearness to the Sun, receives twice the light that Earth receives and also shines by her own light. It is not a wise conclusion of our scientists that because any given planet is nearer the Sun than we are its climate and conditions would make the sustaining of life thereon impossible. Life always adjusts itself to whatever conditions exist. Hence, bodies and ideas connected with the state of matter due to the nearness of the Sun would exactly fit those existing conditions. Thus we may look upon the various planets as brothers of our own—members of one great humanity scattered in different portions of the great universe—belonging to the same family, and only working under different conditions. All have their direct effects upon us, the influence of one planet predominating over another in accord with the angle of position. Some planets are beneficial in their influence; others are called malevolent in their effects upon man. But WE stand as individuals in the midst of a great mass of beings in every direction in our solar system and beyond—all moving in the same direction, all springing from the same Source—however much the

path of each humanity and of each individual differs—the Source and Goal the same for all.

We are influenced by other planets just as we are influenced by other people in our daily walks in life. What is it that causes others to influence us against our own good will, our own right perceptions? Nothing but our mistaken ideas as to what we are, and our suppositions that we can be thus affected—our attitude towards ideas, towards people, towards things, towards life in general. We think that conditions and circumstances bring us to whatever state we are in. That is not true. It is not the conditions nor the circumstances, but the attitude we hold toward them, which matters; the true attitude held with regard to our own natures gives us the power to withstand any influence whatever. According to our attitude, and according to our understanding that all things material and physical evolve from and are ruled by the spiritual, will we—the real Thinkers—receive the effect of any planet. Neither good nor evil can come to us unless there is good or evil within ourselves. If we are good, no evil can touch us. If we are evil, then for the time no good can touch us. All states are within ourselves, as we ought to understand by seeing that one gets good effects and another bad effects from precisely the same set of circumstances. So, we are not the victims of circumstances save as we make ourselves the victims.

A true understanding of planetary influence would involve an absolute realization of man's nature in all his constituents, in every principle and every element, which are those of the solar system to which he belongs. Each one of us is a copy of the great universe. Each one of us is connected with every class of beings. We have within us every form of consciousness and every state of substance, and if we understand ourselves, we can move in accord with all the rest, every influence coming our way, or even perceptible to us, only an aid by which we may do good to others. Then we shall be neither oppressed nor elevated by any influence; we can be repressed or oppressed only by our own erroneous thought, will, feelings and actions. We have established a daily tabernacle which has its peculiarities, but it is our own establishing—built by our own thoughts and doings and by no one else's. It was not imposed upon us by any "Being," nor, in fact, was it necessary, except as we were ignorant, and effects flowed through our ignorance. Now, we can either *learn,* or maintain the condition through continued ignorance.

Being at any given time or place subject to certain beneficial or malevolent influences, being born as persons at a certain time and place, under certain conjunctions of the planets are only fulfillments of Karmic law. We could not have come through any "holes in the sky" except those we had made for ourselves; we could not have made a place of entrance at certain conjunctions of the planets, except the conditions for us were there at that time and at no other time. Planetary influences express our *tendencies,*

yes; but there is no "God" above to compel us, and there is no possibility of our being pushed into the following of certain wrong tendencies unless we want to be pushed. If we have made up our minds not to be so influenced, then we cannot be. We simply do not follow those tendencies in ourselves which we have discovered to be wrong, and so, we make another kind of birth possible.

So-called astrological prognostications of the present day relate chiefly to the body and its environment, and on that basis people seek only for good, try to dodge sickness and evil. On the basis of our own true natures we should not seek for good, nor even to *be* good. We should seek to *do* good, and then, we can see we *are* good. We are not trying for any reward, but trying only to make ourselves efficient ministers of good to others. So, we do not have to avoid evil because we are not creating evil. Wherever and whenever we give forth evil we receive the effects of evil; whenever and wherever we give forth good we receive the effects of good. Each one is absolutely and unconditionally responsible for the condition in which he finds himself. To blame planetary influences for this or that condition is as foolish as to blame the water for drowning a man whose own carelessness, and not the water, was responsible for the drowning. But the same laws govern other planets as ours, and we do make of ourselves magnets which draw to ourselves like things in operation at any given time anywhere. If we are subject to despondency in ourselves, for instance, we shall certainly receive all the effects that despondent conditions anywhere put upon us. This is the nature of our interdependence and inter-relation with every other being in our solar system.

It remains for man to see and *realize* that he has within him all the elements of the great ocean of Life. It remains for him, in that realization, to *act* as one who understands all the rest, and who sends out benefit in every direction for those knowing still less than he does.

FROM THE "FAREWELL BOOK"*

The Master's love is bountiful; its light shines upon thy face and shall make all the crooked ways straight for thee.

Let Karma judge thee and also plead thy cause against the unrighteous.

By patience and virtue add hourly and daily to the strength of your character, which is all that you will carry into your next life.

Their abuse is but of the visible personality; they cannot touch thee, invisible, unconquerable.

---

*These Extracts were printed by William Q. Judge in *The Path*, April, May, June, July, 1895, inclusive. The title used is our own. (EDITORS THEOSOPHY.)

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT*

CHAPTER XII

BY 1889, despite all obstacles and all limitations, despite all the guerilla warfare of antagonistic elements and all the heavy artillery of the numerous "exposures" of H. P. B., the Theosophical Movement had gained such headway that the word "Theosophy" was part of the vocabulary of every intelligent person, the Theosophical Society was established in every civilized country and in every large city, the public announcement of the Esoteric Section had drawn the attention of the mystically inclined to the fact of the existence of a definite school of occult instruction. The student will have poorly gauged the force of the powerful metaphysical current at work if he is not prepared to witness a more striking example of the real "theosophical phenomena" than any so far produced.

The great storm of 1889-90 does not vary in essentials from those which preceded it. The drama is the same. It is the first scene of the third act; the intensity of the parts played and the lines spoken, strictly in accord with the dramatic unities. For in real life as in its mimic counterpart, the action continually progresses and each succeeding cycle stresses towards the catastrophe under the cumulative effects of the Law of Acceleration.

Originally a newspaper writer and novelist, Mabel Collins, then a young woman, had joined the "London Lodge" in 1884. Imaginative and sensitive in temperament she became intensely interested, not in Theosophy, but in the "psychical activities" pursued by many of the members of that Lodge. During that year she produced "The Idyll of the White Lotus." This was followed, early in 1885, by "Light on the Path," a Treatise written for the personal use of those who are ignorant of the Eastern Wisdom, and who desire to enter within its influence. Written down by M. C., Fellow of the Theosophical Society." As this was the first, and up to that time the only, apparently simple and direct statement of the "rules" of practical occultism, and as it was plainly hinted that the book was "inspired" it attracted immediate attention. Moreover, its inherent merit, the sustained beauty of its diction, the noble simplicity of its expression of the loftiest ethics, the moral grandeur of the ideals submitted as within the reach of human attainment, at once gave it rank as a theosophical classic. "Through the Gates of Gold," from the same pen, appeared in 1887. In the autumn of the same year, when Madame Blavatsky began the publication of "Lucifer," the name of Mabel Collins appeared with her own as Editor. In view of the circumstances it was but natural

*Corrections, objections, criticisms, questions and comments are invited from all readers on any facts or conclusions stated in this series.—EDITORS.

that Theosophists everywhere should hold Miss Collins in the highest respect and regard.

When, therefore, with the issue of February 15, 1889, the name of Mabel Collins disappeared from "Lucifer," it was inevitable that a furor of curiosity and interest should set in. This was accentuated by the fact that Miss Collins retired to privacy and gave no hint as to the cause of the breach; "Lucifer" gave no explanations and made no comments; Mr. Judge's "Path" and Colonel Olcott's "Theosophist" remained equally silent. There the matter rested, so far as concerned public knowledge of events "behind the scenes," until the month of May.

On May 11, 1889, there appeared in the "Religio-Philosophical Journal" a letter from Elliott Coues, embodying a letter to him from Mabel Collins. The "Religio-Philosophical Journal" was an old established and leading Spiritualist publication printed at Chicago and edited by Colonel Bundy, a life-long Spiritualist and a friend of Prof. Coues. Colonel Bundy had been admitted to membership in the Theosophical Society in 1885, on the recommendation of Prof. Coues and was a member of the "Gnostic" Branch of the T. S., at Washington, D. C., a Branch founded by Prof. Coues who was and had been its President from the beginning. "The Religio-Philosophical Journal" had previously given publicity to attacks upon H. P. B., by W. Emmette Coleman, whose life was for many years chiefly devoted to that purpose and of whom we will treat later on.

The Coues-Collins letters, and other communications from the same source in later issues of "The Religio-Philosophical Journal," made grave charges against H. P. B.,—grave in themselves, and doubly so from the reputation of those who made them. Of Miss Collins we have spoken. It is necessary that the reader should know something of Professor Coues.

Of Catholic family and education, Elliott Coues was a university graduate and originally by profession an American Army surgeon attached to various posts and expeditions. Highly educated, exceedingly versatile, of independent means, he became interested in various branches of science and pursued his studies and investigations to such good purpose that he soon ranked as an authority on many subjects. He published various books and was invited to edit that portion of the "Century Dictionary" dealing with his specialties. Early in the '80's of the last century, while still in the prime of life, he awakened to an interest in "psychical research," and conducted many experiments of his own with chosen "subjects." He early became a member of the London Society for Psychical Research and was in London in the summer of 1884, at the time the S. P. R. Committee was making its "preliminary investigation and report" on the "Theosophical phenomena." He sought out Colonel Olcott who was naturally rejoiced to make his

acquaintance, and finding his interest, to induct him into membership in the Theosophical Society. In company with Colonel Olcott, Prof. Coues and his wife journeyed to Elberfeld, Germany, to meet H. P. B., who was at the time with the trusted and trusting Gebhards. A great and spontaneous affection sprang up between Mrs. Coues and H. P. B.—an affection which never lapsed, on the one side or on the other.

Prof. Coues met Col. Olcott again at London later in the year 1884, and was by Colonel Olcott appointed a member of the newly constituted "American Board of Control" of the Theosophical Society. On his return to the United States he established the "Gnostic" Branch of the T. S. In 1885 he was active in the formation of the American Society for Psychical Research along the same lines of enquiry as pursued by its British predecessor. He was elected Chairman of the "American Board of Control" of the T. S., and in the midst of his multifarious activities in other directions busied himself in correspondence with members of the Society. Of engaging manners and distinguished appearance, as excellent a speaker as he was brilliant a writer, he was a very popular lecturer and gave many addresses before scientific bodies, clubs and other associations. Although he never made any distinctly Theosophical addresses there runs through all his lectures of the period a definite note of inquiry and suggestion of broader fields of investigation than those passing current under the name of "science." Although he was not a contributor to the Theosophical literature of the times, as editor of the "Biogen Series" he brought out an American edition of Col. Olcott's "Buddhist Catechism," republished the monograph, "Can Matter Think?" and published with an introduction and notes by himself Robert Dodsley's "True and Complete Œconomy of Human Life," originally issued at London in 1750. To this reprint he added the sub-title, "Based on the System of Theosophical Ethics." This phrase, his use of the name "Kuthumi"—a variant spelling of *Koot Hoomi,* the *Mahatma* to whom Mr. Sinnett's "Occult World" is dedicated—some questionable expressions in his introduction and notes, and his personal prominence and known affiliation with the Theosophical Society, gave Mr. Judge occasion to insert in the "Path" for July, 1886, two references, one a review complimentary to the "Biogen Series" and to Professor Coues personally, and the other a correction of possible misconceptions, in the following words:

"The association of the name Kuthumi with the book, so perplexing to understand, is not a biographical fact, as Prof. Coues explains in his 'foreword' (p. 10). It only remains to state clearly what is implied in the foreword that the Theosophical Society has no special code of morals, ready made and rigorously defined, for the acceptance of its members on admission."

By the summer of 1886, it became evident that the "Board of Control," originally promulgated by Col. Olcott at Mr. Judge's request in order to avoid delay in the conduct of the official routine of the American Branches, was, in the hands of Prof. Coues, a mere exchange of the paternal autocracy of Col. Olcott for the arbitrary autocracy of Prof. Coues. Mr. Judge had recourse to H. P. B. and Col. Olcott, and at a meeting of the Board of Control, held at Rochester, N. Y., at the house of Mrs. Cables on July 4, 1886, additional "orders" from Col. Olcott and his Indian General Council were presented by Mr. Judge, calling for a revised plan whereby an "American Section of the General Council" was to be formed. In this "American Council" was to be merged the "Board of Control," the members of which, as also the Presidents of Branches, were to become *ex officio* members of the "American Council." Provision was also to be made for the election of additional members of the "American Council" by the votes of the members of the Society.

Notwithstanding this promulgation, Prof. Coues, immediately after his return to his home, issued of his own motion the following:

AMERICAN BOARD OF CONTROL—OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

Washington, D. C., July 12, 1886.

It is desired that *The Occult Word* become the official organ of the American Board of Control of the Theosophical Society.

Correspondents having notes and news respecting the Society in America are requested to send them to *The Occult Word*. Members and others having the interests of the Society at heart will do well to extend the circulation of *The Occult Word*.

Contributors of articles upon speculative, doctrinal, or operative Theosophy will be individually responsible therefor, as heretofore.

ELLIOTT COUES, President.

It was already an open secret that Mrs. Cables, another member of the "Board of Control," and her associate, Mr. Brown, were disaffected with the "Theosophical Mahatmas," a disaffection which burst into flame a few months later, as we have narrated in an earlier chapter. Prof. Coues' use of the word "President" in his communication, the communication itself, and his ignoring of the "Path," already firmly established as the Theosophical organ *par excellence*, and of the action just taken at the Rochester meeting, all point to the existence of a cabal within the Society, rooted in India, England and America, having for its object the overthrow of the influence of H. P. B., and Mr. Judge in their occult status, and their paramount if unofficial direction of the lines of the Society's work in the world.

In the "Path" for August, 1886, Mr. Judge, knowing well the tangential activities of Professor Coues, Mrs. Cables and others, and their inevitable outcome, published in the section, "Reviews and Notes, an article, *Theosophy in the Press,* in which, after noting the sudden appearance within a few months of many articles in the daily papers "full of misstatements mixed with ignorance of . . . Theosophy," he goes on to say:

"But some Theosophists have been guilty of ventilating in the papers the statement that Theosophy is astralism, that is to say, that the object of the Society is to induce people to go into the study and practice of spirit raising, cultivating the abnormal faculties, of clairvoyance and the like, ignoring entirely the prime object, real end, aim and *raison d'être* of the movement—universal brotherhood and ethical teaching. In fact, we make bold to assert, from our own knowledge and from written documents, that the Mahatmas, who started the Society, and who stand behind it now, are distinctly opposed to making prominent these phenomenal leanings, this hunting after clairvoyance and astral bodies, and they have so declared most unmistakably, stating their wish and advice to be, that *'the Society should prosper on its ethical, philosophical and moral worth alone.'*

"Theosophists should haste to see that this false impression created at large, that it is a dangerous study, or that it is any way dangerous, or that we conceal our reasons for doing what we are doing, is done away with. . . If one or two persons in the Society imagine that the pursuit of psychical phenomena is its real end and aim and so declare, that weighs nothing against the immense body of the membership or against its widespread literature; it is merely their individual bias.

"But at the same time, this imagination and misstatement are dangerous, and insidiously so. It is just the impression which the Jesuit college desires to be spread abroad concerning us, so that in one place ridicule may follow, and in another superstitious dread of the thing; which ever of these may happen to obtain, they would be equally well pleased.

"Let Theosophists attend to this, and let them not forget, that the only authoritative statements of what are the ends and objects of the Society are contained in those printed in its by-laws. No amount of assertion to the contrary by any officer or member can change that declaration."

In the September, 1886, number of the "Path" was printed the notice of the receipt of the "formal orders" to form the "American Council." On this Mr. Judge comments: "This action is eminently wise, as the term *Board of Control* was misleading, inasmuch as the very foundation of the Society is democratic in its nature, and *control* savored too much of form, ceremonies, discipline, officers, secret reports and all the paraphernalia of an established church."

The expression "Board of Control" was Colonel Olcott's coinage. The various stages recounted were accepted by Mr. Judge as necessary intermediate steps in the effort to arrive at real democracy among the American Theosophists. Col. Olcott was at all times loath to surrender his "paternal government" of the Society as a whole, and he acceded to the gradual emancipation of the Society in America only under the steady pressure of Mr. Judge, reinforced by the insistence of H. P. B. He at last consented to issue his "official order" for the formation of the "American Section of the Theosophical Society," and at a meeting of the "Board of Control," held at Cincinnati in October, 1886, and attended also by delegates and members from numerous Branches, the arrangements were perfected for the first Convention at New York City in April, 1887, at which elected delegates from all the Branches were present, adopted a constitution, and elected officers and a council. The first formal Convention was held the next year, April, 1888, at Chicago.

Meantime a "lively interchange of letters," as "Old Diary Leaves" phrases it, had been going on, not only between H. P. B. and Col. Olcott over the threatening breach between them on matters of policy and the forthcoming "Esoteric Section," but as well among Prof. Coues, Mr. Judge, Col. Olcott and H. P. B. over affairs in America—as may readily be inferred from what has been written.

There can be no doubt that Col. Olcott, impressed by the prominence and ability of Prof. Coues, as well as himself smarting from the wounds to his vanity and self-sufficiency received in his collisions with H. P. B., sympathized with that gentleman, whose views were entirely congenial to him. Nor can it, we think, be doubted that Prof. Coues, fully informed as to Olcott's feelings, those of Mr. Sinnett and others, may well have concluded that he had but to lead in the coming battle, and all the disaffected would openly as well as secretly support him. And in this he could but have been encouraged by the reflections of his own ruffled egotism. Able, audacious and subtle, he was writing in one strain to Olcott, in another to H. P. B. and in a third to Mr. Judge. Like so many others he was entirely unaware that H. P. B. and Mr. Judge, working as one in the Cause dear to them, made no moves, the one without the other, nor ever wrote letters or other communications on moot Theosophical matters without supplying each other with copies. Nor was it conceivable to him or to many others prominent in the Society that the *Occultism* of H. P. B. and Mr. Judge was genuine and not spurious or mediumistic, otherwise he would have realized that his own nature and that of all others was an open book to them and that they could not be deceived by any pretense or hypocrisy, however they might receive each comer at his own protestations of value, leaving to time and to himself to show him in his true *colors*.

Olcott, honest to the core, loyal in his better moments to both his Colleagues, was yet, by reason of his personal weaknesses and past life, almost wholly susceptible to the arts of those who knew how to play and prey upon his vanity, his fears and doubts concerning the welfare of his beloved Society, of which he had long since constituted himself the tutelary deity. Much may be read and inferred of the unwritten history of this period from the following extract from one of the "President-Founder's" letters to Professor Coues:

"Another warning: Beware how you encourage H. P. B. to act outside her special province of mystical research and esoteric teaching. The Council will stand no nonsense, nor shall I ratify a single order or promise of hers made independently of me and my full antecedent possession of the facts. She telegraphed to abolish the Board of Control and has just issued a revolutionary commission to Arthur Gebhard with an idiotic disregard of the proprieties and of her own position. She seems a Bourbon as to memory and receptivity and fancies the old halcyon days are not gone. I shall neither ratify what she has done, nor anything of the sort she may in future do. Within her domain she is queen; outside that—well, fill in the blank yourself. Several attempts have been made to get her to set up a rival society. . . . She has not yet been fool enough to fall into the trap, nor do I think her brain will soften to the point of doing it. She would thereby take a life-contract for a fight; . . . and find herself with enfeebled health, advanced years and a tainted reputation recommencing our work of 1875, without, pardon me, an Olcott to stick to her, as I have, through thick and thin and bear shame and disgrace with mute endurance."

As we have seen, Colonel Olcott did, despite this and many similar outbursts, "ratify" officially and publicly the numerous "revolutionary" actions of H. P. B. When it came to "taking a life contract for a fight" with her, both his intuitive loyalty and his personal prudence alike counseled him to submit to her guidance where he could not support it. Not till long after her death did his weakening faculties and the jaundiced mind induced by sycophants and disloyal Theosophists whom he trusted lead him to befoul and dishonor publicly the memory of his departed Teacher and benefactor in the conspiracy to destroy the name and fame of his and her Colleague, Mr. Judge.

At the Chicago Convention at the end of April, 1888, Professor Coues was present as a delegate and President of the Gnostic branch of the T. S. He was elected Chairman of the Convention and presided over its sessions. The newspapers of the city gave a good deal of space to the proceedings and reporters were present at all of the open meetings. Following the Convention the Chicago "*Tribune*" published, without disclosing the source from which it

had received them, a letter and *facsimile* of an alleged "message from a Mahatma" to Dr. Coues. Naturally this aroused considerable passing curiosity among the general public, and a very decided interest among American Theosophists. No public notice was taken of the matter either by H. P. B. or Mr. Judge, but the latter wrote privately to Dr. Coues, who responded as follows, under date of May 21, 1888:

"*My dear Judge:*—I think that on reflection you will find yourself a little hasty in pitching into me about that 'Tribune' matter. . . . Now I saw that letter of which you complain fall down from the air over a person's head, precisely in the same manner as you have seen a like letter fall—one, of which we have since heard a good deal. The writing on one side was in that peculiar hand which I have learned to recognize in several expressions of the will of the Blessed Masters which you have been good enough to send me. . . . The writing on the other side must have been subsequently precipitated and the seal affixed. . . . If K. H. had not wished about 75,000 persons to be advised of the mode in which he brought about the Convention in Chicago he could easily have dematerialized that document. . . . It was clearly the will of the Brotherhood that the T. S. should be thus broadly advertised—and no doubt it would also be by the will of the same august personages, if the 'Religio'* for example should contain some day a column or two explaining the delicate and mysterious manner in which rice-paper communications are 'precipitated' out of the Akasa."

This is clearly a tacit admission on Coues' part that he furnished the "message" to the "*Tribune,*" that he "saw" it precipitated, and an insinuation that he had received from Mr. Judge similar "messages." To Dr. Coues' letter Mr. Judge replied intimating that the whole tale, "messages" and all, originated in Dr. Coues' own brain. Under date of June 11, 1888, Prof. Coues replied to Mr. Judge's warnings that such a course was certain to cause trouble to himself and the T. S.:

"*Dear Judge:*—But now comes another trouble. It appears, and not from 'Coues' brain,' but from a much more material and very likely much stupider source, that you have been opposing my long standing candidacy for the Esoteric presidency, in order to keep the ostensible control of T. S. in your own hand and make yourself the real or actual head of the concern in America, leaving me only as a figure-head; and I am referred to all and any newspaper reports which emanate from the Aryan* or yourself, as carefully suppressing or at least not putting forward my name, etc."

It had become very well known amongst members of the T. S. in the United States that Dr. Coues, in the course of his personal propagandum had broadly hinted at his own occult relations with

*"Religio" means the *Religio-Philosophical Journal.*

†"Aryan" means the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York City, the reorganization of the Parent T. S. Mr. Judge was President of the Aryan Society.

the Mahatmas and his own psychical powers, and as neither Mr. Judge nor H. P. B. in any way confirmed his claims, more or less questioning and suspicion arose in regard to him and his ulterior purposes. Thus "hoist with his own petard," Dr. Coues endeavored to turn his tactics to better advantage in the attempt to gain for himself the powerful support of H. P. B. in his ambition to be the actual and public head of the Society in America ,and as part of his campaign to enfold Mr. Judge in the soiled robes of his pretended messages. H. P. B. replied guardedly to his communications, agreeing where she could with Coues' strictures and criticisms on Olcott, Judge, and the "management" of the Society, encouraging him to live up to his own protestations of loyalty, influence, and devotion to the Society, ignoring his egotism and blandishments, correcting him only where the issue raised was point blank. On Christwas day, 1888, he wrote her a bombastic and fulsome letter. Mr. Judge was at the time in England with H. P. B.; Col. Olcott, furious with her action in the Paris T. S. and her plain speaking with him, had just departed after his "pitched battle" with her, and his reconciliation due chiefly to the Master's letter, as has already been told. Col. Olcott had been in communication with Prof. Coues and had poured out his feelings as we have seen. Prof. Coues' Christmas letter to H. P. B. was intended to advantage himself of the supposed strained relations all around. We quote his closing phrases:

"Is your 'first-born,' the meek Hibernian Judge,* still with your majesty? Give my love to him and say, I don't get up very early, but I stay up very late. I am glad you made it all right with your psychologized baby Olcott when he was with you. . . .

"And after all, dear H. P. B., I am really very fond and very proud of you, and admire your genius as only a man of genius can. So here's my blessing, and all good wishes, for the greatest woman of this age, *who is born to redeem her times,* and go down to everlasting historical fame.

"Ever yours, still in the psychic Maelstrom,

DARIUS HYSTASPES II."

In one of her letters to Coues, H. P. B. had called Mr. Judge her "first born"; Col. Olcott she had spoken of as a "psychologized baby" when referring to the effects upon him of his twenty years' dabbling with mediums and his never-ending thirst for "phenomena." "Darius Hystaspes II" was a favorite signature of Dr. Coues in writing to H. P. B., as "Dr. Faustus" was in his letters to Mr. Judge.

April 16, 1889, just prior to the Convention of the American Section for that year, Dr. Coues wrote H. P. B. a long letter detailing his own greatness and influence, the strength of his "Gnostic"

*Mr. Judge was of Irish parentage and birth.

branch (it had some 30 members all told, at the time, none of them active Theosophically), and with half veiled threats tried to induce her to ask the American Theosophists to place him at their head. Thus:

"You appear to have been misinformed or uninformed respecting the Gnostic and its Branches, as well as my own work in your behalf. Both in numbers and in quality of its membership, the Gnostic is unquestionably the leading Branch of the T. S. in the country. Its members are for the most part of a high, refined, educated and influential class in society, in science and before the world, and most of them are indefatigable in working for the cause to which your own great and noble life is devoted. I am satisfied that if you would do *your* part to give my Gnostics their just dues and recognition, they and I can lift theosophy clear of the mud which has been thrown upon it and set your own self in a proper light before the world. We all feel keenly the abuse and persecution to which you have been subjected, and anxious to do you full justice and honor. But they are unanimously dissatisfied with the way the society is run at present, and they wonder where your INTUITION can be, that you fail to see where your obvious advantage lies, in not strengthening and holding up the hands of their representative man [Prof. Coues]. . . . Be wise now and be warned in time: you are a very great woman, who should be quick to see that this is no ordinary occasion. I tell you frankly, it is possible that all this prestige, social and personal and professional influence, scientific attainment and public interest, can be thrown on the side of the T. S., as at present constituted, or can be switched off on a new track aside from the old lines. If you cannot SEE this, and understand it, and act accordingly, there is nothing more for me to say, and I must presume that you do not care for my people. Judge and I came to a fair understanding once, and I was carrying out our agreement in good faith, and all was smooth, when something or other, affecting the question of *the Presidency*, interfered, and since then there has been nothing but friction and misunderstanding in the 'Esoteric' T. S.—which you know consisted of yourself, myself and Judge: and your issue of a new and different 'esoteric' manifesto did not mend matters. Now be *wise* and POLITIC. . . . The T. S. in America is at present a HEADLESS monstrosity: it must have a visible, official head to represent its real, invisible source. You know whom the majority of the F. T. S. have desired to put forward as their representative theosophist in America. It is only necessary for you to cable the Chicago Convention, to elect him president. Weigh these words well; pause, consider, reflect and ACT. 'If 'twere well done, 'twere well done quickly.'"

The next day, April 17, 1889, he wrote her further on the same subject and, with incomparable effrontery, included the following choice gems of his egotism and of his mendacity:

". . . do you know you are getting great discredit in this country and for what do you suppose? for being *jealous of me!* Can you imagine such flapdoodle? You are not moved by abuse, but you want to know how people think and what they say, and a great many are talking loudly and wildly, that your silence respecting my books in the 'Secret Doctrine,' and the absence of my name from 'Lucifer' (as well as from 'The Path') means that you are afraid of my growing power, and will brook no rival so dangerously near the papal throne of theosophy. . . . There is another queer thing. You have somehow got it stuck in your mind, that I put in the Chicago *'Tribune'* last year a caricature of the Master K. H. I had nothing whatever to do with the article, which was merely a newspaper skit, and the lithographed effusion was no more a Mahatmic document than this letter. It was simply a piece of newspaper wit.

"Judge is a good fellow and means well, and I like him for many things, especially his devotion to you and the masters and their Cause; but dabbling in occultism, especially on a Mahatmic altitude is dangerous except to an Adept!! I am the humble servant of *my* Mahatma."

The American Convention met at the end of the same month. Prof. Coues was not present. He was not elected "President" or any other officer of the American Section. H. P. B. did not cable the Convention as requested. On the contrary, her formal Letter to that Convention had distinct reference to the class of "theosophists" of which Prof. Coues was such a shining example, as may be observed from the extracts given in the last Chapter. And under date of April 30, 1889, she wrote Prof. Coues from London, saying:

"Dear Doctor Coues: I have received your two letters and read them as they stand and also between the lines and therefore I mean to be as frank with you as you are frank with me. I will take your two letters point by point."

Point by point she goes over the various matters in Prof. Coues letters, in friendly, considerate, but severely plain language, and on the subject of the "message from the Mahatma" she says:

"3. If you had nothing to do with the Chicago *Tribune* article (tho' you must have influence with your own nephew) then why did you not contradict it, then and there?

4. I know nothing about the number of messages you may have received from Masters through Judge, whom I would never believe capable of it, or any one else. . . . You speak of my seals on those letters. . . . Where did they get this? From Judge, from me or from you? It could hardly have been any except one of us three. . . . Your wise advice that such Mahatma messages should be confined to one channel, 'the only genuine and original H. P. B.

your friend,' was anticipated by Mahatma K. H. in so many words. Then why do you kick against that? You speak of *your* Mahatma, then why don't you send letters in his name instead of those of my Master and Mahatma K. H. That would settle all the difficulties and there would be no quarrel. . . . What you have learned through me, I know, and do not want to know beyond. You may obey or disobey your Master as much as you like, if you know him to exist outside of your psychic visions. As to mine, every man devoid of all psychic powers can see him, since he is a living man. I wish he could be yours, for then, my dearest Dr. you would be spiritually a better man and a less sceptical one than you are.

"You speak of your eagerness 'to defend and help a woman who has been sadly persecuted, because misunderstood.' Permit me to say to you for the last time that no bitterest enemy of mine has ever misunderstood me as you do.

"To close, as a friend, the husband of a woman whom I love and respect, you can get almost anything from me (except treachery to the Masters and the Society); . . .

"Work for the Society and show me that you can do it good, real good, and my life will be at your service. . . .

"My best love to Mrs. Coues, if she will accept it.

"Ever yours and sincerely,

H. P. BLAVATSKY."

The reader will recall the shameless cunning of the Coulombs who, under no matter what instruction or impulsion, busied themselves in the dual device of writing letters protesting their loyalty and devotion to H. P. B. and her Society, while at the same time working with might and main to prepare the trap-doors and sliding panels and forged letters, that they might be ready with physical "evidence" of the "frauds" of H. P. B. in case their jesuitical net failed to entrap the victim. Dr. Coues, man of the world, scientist of the highest standing, wealthy, where the Coulombs were ignorant, poor and mere helpless tools, paralleled exactly in his methods the duplicity employed by the missionaries through their dupes, the Coulombs. His dupe was Mabel Collins, and in the very days that he was writing his protestations of confidence, of loyalty, of support to H. P. B., her Society and the Cause sacred to her, he was busily engaged in weaving the threads of his "noose of Kali" that, if he failed in gaining the end coveted by his ambition, he could have his revenge upon his intended victim.

We may now intelligibly consider the Coues-Collins assault upon the integrity of H. P. B. and her mission in the "Religio-Philosophical Journal," and its after-math in the New York "Sun."

(To be Continued)

THE SPIRIT IN THE BODY*

For Spirit, when invested with matter or *prakriti,* experienceth the qualities which proceed from *prakriti;* its connection with these qualities is the cause of its rebirth in good and evil wombs. The Spirit in the body is called *Maheswara,* the Great Lord, the spectator, the admonisher, the sustainer, the enjoyer, and also the *Paramatma,* the highest soul. —Bhagavad-Gita, Chapter XIII.

THE coming together of Theosophists of differing degrees and qualities—yes, of training—is bound to stir up latent personalities, preconceptions and prejudices; for the mental and psychic atmosphere engendered by their co-operation must work inwards as well as outwards, and still further must arouse evil forces, for it is a known occult law that every advance made along the path that leads to self-lessness arouses the forces that are opposed to that consummation, and this is true individually and collectively. In this immense work which we have undertaken, trials of various kinds have to be encountered, and the ones by whom we are tried are those of our own household. There are lessons in every event, even the smallest. We have to do the best we can and leave the results to the Great Law.

About the meetings: Your idea in regard to them is all right. Go right ahead in whatever way seems to afford the best opportunity; use your best judgment and don't be disappointed at anything in the way of results that may turn up, just keep on looking for ways and means. Act as seems best under any circumstances that may arise. Something will come of it. If that something is different from what you would have liked or planned for, never mind, keep on going. Better make no plan other than to get to work along the line of least resistance. One step will bring another—"C'est le premier pas qui coute."

As to ———'s opinion of L———. It is only of value to those who see value in it, and in any event it is only an opinion. It has been said that he who speaks of seeing and meeting the Master thereby loses touch. My judgment would be that if, as is said, L—— had stood "face to face with the 'Great Initiator'" it would never have been spoken of by him, and no other would know the fact. L—— sought to be recognized as a great teacher and in order to break into other realms of nature used most abhorrent means—black magic in fact. One may be sure that anyone claiming Adeptship is not an Adept, and this in the very nature of things. Apply this to L——— and B——— who are continually making public claims in this direction. The question arises, how much is real, how much for effect, how much self-delusion. The imagination is the image-making power and may create a glorified image of oneself. I am sorry it all occurred for in the public mind Theosophy is connected with it, and many strange things are assumed to be Theosophy.

Perhaps I should submit to you my opinion that in the interests of those who are new to the subject of Theosophy, and because of

*From the letters of Robert Crosbie. Here published for the first time.

the general tendency to follow personalities (particularly living ones), it is not wise to put such in mental touch with writers, who however good any particular writing may be, have failed to show a true appreciation of Theosophic principles, and I do this at the risk of being misunderstood. It is for you to accept or reject my opinion as it meets your viewpoint.

The most painful experiences I have had in my Theosophical life have been the witnessing of the negation of Theosophic principles by those professing them, and were it not my duty to put you in possession of the facts as I know them—facts which represent dangers which lie about us in our quest—I would not have spoken. You asked for the facts—I have to give them as I know them. It should be said that while we condemn the act, we never condemn the actor; for a Theosophist must recognize that failures are not irremediable if followed by undaunted struggles upwards, and for professing Theosophists who to our eyes appear to have strayed from the Path, we know that the time will come when the failure will be recognized and the struggle back will be hard. Such must necessarily have our pity and sympathy if we are true to the spirit of the Teachings.

Here and there failures will be noted, but there is much to encourage. There is a distinct change for the better in public sentiment; religions, sciences and governments are changing little by little. The Great Ones do not repine; neither do they cease working. Let us follow Their example. You may remember that K. H. wrote, "He who does all he knows and the best he can does enough for us," and again, "Ingratitude is not one of our vices."

Now possibly it may be seen what our Lodge stands for; the three objects as laid down by H. P. B. and Masters, and along the lines laid down by Them. No dogmatism, no personal followings, no spiritual authority. Thus each may follow his line of development with such assistance as may be afforded by those who have traveled further on the Path than himself, when such help is requested. In this way true discrimination is gained and the bane of all spiritual movements, authority, dogmatism and their corollary, personal followings, avoided.

Perhaps you may have seen how solicitious I have been to get you started right; free from mental incumbrances, using your judgment always to check your intuitions, until in the course of time you come to a direct perception of truth; why I am so fearful of any abridgement of individual judgment, or cessation of effort to develop individual intuition. I see that you can be of much help and to fit you for that as far as my assistance may avail, will be my duty and pleasure, but always remember that behind the immediate helper, there is the Great Lodge whose aid is given to all who serve—serve Them.

Well, good night to you, with best thoughts,

As ever,

CONTEMPLATION*

II.

NOTWITHSTANDING the article on the above subject in the February *Theosophist,* many of its readers still seem to imagine that "contemplation" is a particular form of gazing or staring at something, which process, when undergone a set number of hours every day, will give psychological powers. This misunderstanding is apparently due to the fact that the main point discussed has been lost sight of. Instead of realising that there is but one chief idea meant to be conveyed by that article by arguing it through many of its phases, it seems to be imagined that almost every sentence expresses quite a distinct idea. It may not therefore be uninteresting or unprofitable to revert to the subject and put forward the same idea from another standpoint and, if possible, in a clearer light. It must first be borne in mind that the writer of the article did not at all mean to imply the act of gazing by the word "contemplation." The former word would have been made use of, were that the idea. "The Imperial Dictionary of the English Language," (1883)—defines the word contemplation thus:

> (1) The act of the mind in considering with attention, meditation; study; continued attention of the mind to a particular subject.
> Specifically—(2) Holy meditation; attention to sacred things.

Webster's dictionary thoroughly revised—also gives the same meaning.

Thus we find that contemplation is the "continued attention of the mind to a particular subject," and, religiously, it is the "attention to sacred things." It is therefore difficult to imagine how the idea of gazing or staring came to be associated with the word contemplation, unless it be due to the fact that generally it so happens that when any one is deeply absorbed in thought, he apparently seems to be gazing or staring at something in blank space. But this gazing is the effect of the act of contemplation. And as usually happens, here too the effect seems to be confounded with the cause. Because the gazing attitude follows the act of contemplation, it is at once assumed that gazing is the cause which produces contemplation! Bearing this well in mind, let us now see what kind of contemplation (or meditation) the *Elixir of Life* recommends for the aspirants after occult knowledge. It says:

"Reasoning from the known to the unknown meditation must be practised and encouraged."

That is to say, a *chela's* meditation should constitute the "reasoning from the known to the unknown." The "known" is the phenomenal world, cognisable by our five senses. And all that we see in this manifested world are the effects, the causes of which

*This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for August, 1884.

are to be sought after in the noumenal, the unmanifested, the "unknown world": this is to be accomplished by meditation, *i.e.*, continued attention to the subject. Occultism does not depend upon one method, but employs both the deductive and the inductive. The student must first learn the general axioms. For the time being, he will of course have to take them as assumptions, if he prefers to call them so. Or as the *Elixir of Life* puts it:

All we have to say is that if you are anxious to drink of the *Elixir of Life* and live a thousand years or so, you must take our word for the matter, at present, and proceed on the assumption. For esoteric science does not give the faintest possible hope that the desired end will ever be attained by any other way; while modern, or the so-called exact science laughs at it.

These axioms have sufficiently been laid out in the articles on the *Elixir of Life* and various others treating on occultism, in the different numbers of the *Theosophist*. What the student has first to do is to *comprehend* these axioms and, by employing the deductive method, to proceed from universals to particulars. He has then to reason from the "known to the unknown," and see if the inductive method of prodeeding from particulars to universals supports those axioms. This process forms the primary stage of true contemplation. The student must first grasp the subject intellectually before he can hope to realise his aspirations. When this is accomplished, then comes the next stage of meditation which is "the inexpressible yearning of the inner man to 'go out towards the infinite.'" Before any such yearning can be properly directed, the goal, to which it is to be its aim to run, must be determined by the preliminary stages. The higher stage, in fact, consists in realising practically what the first steps have placed within one's comprehension. In short, contemplation, in its true sense, is to recognise the truth of Eliphas Levi's saying:

To believe without knowing is weakness; to believe, because one knows, is power.

Or, in other words, to see that "KNOWLEDGE IS POWER." The *Elixir of Life* not only gives the preliminary steps in the ladder of *contemplation* but also tells the reader how to realise the higher conceptions. It traces, by the process of contemplation as it were, the relation of man, "the known," the manifested, the phenomenon, to "the unknown," the unmanifested, the noumenon. It shows to the student what ideal he should contemplate and how to rise up to it. It places before him the nature of the inner capacities of man and how to develope them. To a superficial reader, this may, perhaps, appear as the acme of selfishness. Reflection or contemplation will, however, show the contrary to be the case. For it teaches the student that to comprehend the noumenal, he must identify himself with Nature. Instead of looking upon himself as an isolated being, he must learn to look upon himself as a part of the INTEGRAL WHOLE. For, in the unmanifested world, it can be

clearly perceived that all is controlled by the "Law of Affinity," the attraction of one to the other. There, all is Infinite Love, understood in its true sense.

It may now be not out of place to recapitulate what has already been said. The first thing to be done is to study the axioms of Occultism and work upon them by the deductive and the inductive methods, which is real contemplation. To turn this to a useful purpose, what is theoretically comprehended must be practically realised. It is to be hoped that his explanation may make the meaning of the former article on this subject clearer.

D. K. M.

STRAY MEMORANDA

ON ASTROLOGY—FROM R. C.

Do planets as such have influences upon us?

We make ourselves the slaves of planetary influences. I once knew a man who was a very nice man,—very nice and as honest as any of us. He stayed home one day—Oh, I forgot to say that he followed the stars, or perhaps they chased him, and he had it all figured out for every hour and every day of the week and every month of the year. He got sight of some conjunction that intimated to him that he was going to break his leg next day. Well, he just thought he would get ahead of that! So he stayed at home. His wife asked him to put up a curtain; he went up on a step-ladder, and you know the rest. There was an "influence" that was very, very bad, you see; but what made it? What precipitated it? His own special attitude, of course. He had no reason to break his leg, for you can have no attraction for a thing you don't think about, whether you like it or don't like it. Either way of thinking about a thing affords the attraction for that thing. His thinking about it was what precipitated the mishap.

The logic of the "special attitude" can be seen working out even with animals. I remember a little mongrel dog one day going along on the other side of the street. On the side of the street where I was a lot of other dogs—good-natured, good-looking dogs—were all playing together. This little fellow was going along all right, minding his own business, when he suddenly caught sight of those other dogs. He trembled and sat down and rapped his tail on the sidewalk. Bye and bye he got the courage to take a few steps more; then, he looked over and sat down and rapped his tail some more. A few more steps, and he would sit down again; and so he went on. Now, those dogs didn't notice him at all in the first place. Then, all of a sudden, they saw him and made a rush for him with one accord. He would have been all right if he had gone on and minded his own business; but by his fear he attracted the "influence" and the things that he feared.

THINGS COMMON TO CHRISTIANITY AND THEOSOPHY*

(Concluded)

FOR the purposes of this discussion along the line of comparison we will have to place Christianity on one side and put on the other as representing the whole body of Theosophy, so far as revealed, the other various religions of the world, and see what, if anything, is common between them. First we see that Christianity, being the younger, has borrowed its doctrines from other religions. It is now too enlightened an age to say, as the Church did when Abbe Huc brought back his account of Buddhism from Tibet, that either the devil or wicked men invented the old religions so as to confuse and confute the Christian. Evidently, no matter how done, the system of the Christian is mixed Aryan and Jewish. This could not be otherwise, since Jesus was a Jew, and his best disciples and the others who came after like Paul were of the same race and faith. The early Fathers also, living as they did in Eastern lands, got their ideas from what they found about them.

Next a very slight examination will disclose the fact that the ritual of the Christian Church is also borrowed. Taken from all nations and religions, not one part of it is either of this age or of the Western Hemisphere. The Brahmans have an extensive and elaborate ritual, and so have the Buddhists. The rosary, long supposed by Catholics to be a thing of their own, has existed in Japan for uncounted years, and much before the West had any civilization the Brahman had his form of rosary. The Roman Catholic Christian sees the priest ring the bell at a certain part of the Mass, and the old Brahman knows that when he is praying to God he must also ring a bell to be found in every house as well as in the temple. This is very like what Jesus commanded. He said that prayer must be in secret, that is, where no one can hear; the Brahman rings the small bell so that even if ears be near they shall not hear any words but only the sound of the bell. The Christian has images of virgin and child; the same thing is to be found in Egyptian papyri and in carved statues in India made before the Christian came into existence. Indeed, all the ritual and observance of the Christian churches may be found in the mass of other religions with which for the moment we are making a rough comparison.

Turning now to doctrine, we find again complete agreement with the dogmatic part of Christianity in these older religions. Salvation by faith is taught by some priests. That is an old Brahmanical theory, but with the difference that the Brahman one calls for faith in God as the means, the end, and the object of faith. The Christian adds faith in the son of God. A form of Japanese Buddhism said to be due to Amitabha says that one may be saved

*By Wm Q. Judge An address before the Aryan T. S., New York, January 9, 1894. Reprinted from a pamphlet of similar title published in that year.

by complete faith in Amita Buddha, and that even if one prays but three times to Amita he will be saved in accordance with a vow made by that teacher. Immortality of soul has ever been taught by the Brahmans. Their whole system of religion and of cosmogony is founded on the idea of soul and of the spiritual nature of the universe. Jesus and St. Paul taught the unity of spiritual beings—or men—when they said that heaven and the spirit of God were in us, and the doctrine of Unity is one of the oldest and most important of the Brahmanical scheme. The possibility of arriving at perfection by means of religion and science combined so that a man becomes godlike—or the doctrine of Adepts and Mahatmas as found in Theosophy—is common to Buddhism and Brahmanism, and is not contrary to the teachings of Jesus. He said to his disciples that they could if they would do even greater works—or "miracles"—than he did. To do these works one has to have great knowledge and power. The doctrine assumes the perfectability of humanity and destroys the theory of original sin; but far from being out of concordance with the religion of Jesus, it is in perfect accord. He directed his followers to be perfect even as the Father in heaven is. They could not come up to that command by any possibility unless man has the power to reach to that high state. The command is the same as is found in the ancient Aryan system. Hence, then, whether we look broadly over the field at mere ritual dogma or at ethics, we find the most complete accord between Theosophy and true Christianity.

But now taking up some important doctrines put forward by members of the Theosophical Society under their right of free investigation and free speech, what do we discover? Novelty, it is true, to the mind of the western man half-taught about his own religion, but nothing that is uncommon to Christianity. Those doctrines may be, for the present, such as Reincarnation or rebirth over and over again for the purpose of discipline and gain, for reward, for punishment, and for enlargement of character; next Karma, or exact justice or compensation for all thoughts and acts. These two are a part of Christianity, and may be found in the Bible.

Reincarnation has been regarded by some Christian ministers as essential to the Christian religion. Dr. Edward Beecher said he saw its necessity, and the Rev. Wm. Alger has recorded his view to the same effect. If a Christian insists upon belief in Jesus, who came only eighteen centuries ago after milleniums had passed and men had died out of the faith by millions, it will be unjust for them to be condemned for failure to believe a doctrine they never heard of; hence the Christian may well say that under the law of reincarnation, which was upheld by Jesus, all those who never heard of Jesus will be reborn after his coming in A. D. i, so as to accept the plan of salvation.

In the Gospels we find Jesus referring to this doctrine as if a well established one. When it was broached by the disciples as the possible reason for the punishment by blindness from birth of a man

of the time, Jesus did not controvert the doctrine, as he would have done did he see in his wisdom as Son of God that it was pernicious. But at another time he asserted that John the Baptist was the reincarnation of Elias the ancient prophet. This cannot be wiped out of the books, and is a doctrine as firmly fixed in Christianity, though just now out of favor, as is any other. The paper by Prof. Landsberg shows you what Origen, one of the greatest of the Christian Fathers, taught on preëxistence of souls. This theory naturally suggests reincarnation on this earth, for it is more natural to suppose the soul's wanderings to be here until all that life can give has been gained, rather than that the soul should wander among other planets or simply fall to this abruptly, to be as suddenly raised up to heaven or thrown down to hell.

The next great doctrine is Karma. This is the religion of salvation by works as opposed to faith devoid of works. It is one of the prime doctrines of Jesus. By "by their works ye shall know them", he must have meant that faith without works is dead. The meaning of *Karma* literally is "works", and the Hindus apply it not only to the operations of nature and of the great laws of nature in connection with man's reward and punishment, but also to all the different works that man can perform. St. James insists on the religion of works. He says that true religion is to visit the fatherless and the widows and to keep oneself unspotted from the world. St. Matthew says we shall be judged by every act, word, and thought. This alone is possible under the doctrine of Karma. The command of Jesus to refrain from judgment or we should ourselves be judged is a plain statement of Karma, as is, too, the rest of the verse saying that what we mete out shall be given back to us. St. Paul, following this, distinctly states the doctrine thus: "Brethren, be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that also shall he reap". The word "whatsoever" includes every act and thought, and permits no escape from the consequences of any act. A clearer statement of the law of Karma as applied to daily life could hardly be made. Again, going to Revelations, the last words in the Christian book, we read all through it that the last judgment proceeds on the works—in other words, on the Karma—of men. It distinctly asserts that in the vision, as well as in the messages to the Churches, judgment passes for works.

We therefore must conclude that the religion of Jesus is in complete accord with the chief doctrines of Theosophy; it is fair to assume that even the most recondite of theosophical theories would not have been opposed by him. Our discussion must have led us to the conclusion that the religion of Karma, the practise of good works, is that in which the religion of Jesus agrees with Theosophy, and that alone thereby will arrive the longed-for day when the great ideal of Universal Brotherhood will be realized, and will furnish the common ground on which all faiths may stand and from which every nation may work for the good and the perfection of the human family.

THE POSITION ASSUMED

(THOUGHTS ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA)

NOT until the true POSITION has been assumed does the Holy War begin in reality for the individual. We may have taken this position in former births in ancient lands perhaps, and are but now recommencing the struggle. But the fact that we find ourselves in the midst of it, is proof sufficient that it must at some time have been started.

Finding ourselves standing between the two armies, the flying of missiles already begun, we are suddenly overwhelmed by the stupendous character of the battle and what it means to fight it out to the finish. We behold naught but adverse omens on all sides.

In this place, with the certainty of cyclic law, will the Arjuna of the Holy War find himself again and again, for in reality he has already chosen Krishna as his charioteer and the activity of his Higher Nature is shown in the division of forces. He has asked Krishna to place him where he may survey the opposing forces, and now, in their contemplation, he, Arjuna, falls from his high position for *he sees them as himself.* Overcome by his personal feelings, rent by conflicting desires, his Heart—his resolution in fact—fails him; he is unable to think, and he sinks down declaring "I shall not fight, O Govinda."

He has in reality "thrown away" his weapons of defense; for while he has chosen Krishna as his charioteer, being as yet ignorant of his own powers he has, unconsciously perhaps, but nevertheless actually, thought *himself* sufficient for the Fight, and as Arjuna, had entered the war mentally disposed toward final victory; but now, lost in perplexity, finding no support in his present position, he lets go.

It is in this crucial moment of letting go of *all that he thought himself to be,* that Help comes. For, fortunately for Arjuna as for all true students, the spot that he fell back upon was *his own;* that spot that he had fostered with care—the little flame of intuition that he had allowed to burn. It is his belief in the SELF, in MASTERS. So that even as he sinks down declaring "I shall not fight, O Govinda," he recognizes the Teacher. It is this intuitional recognition of the Source of his support in the midst of his deepest perplexity, and the holding on to that, that enables him to be answered by the Voice of Krishna. For Krishna has been there all the time, standing beside him in the chariot; it was Arjuna and not Krishna who had abandoned his position.

With his attention once more placed on Krishna, he receives that support which enables him to go forward with the fight.

ON THE LOOKOUT

SLANDERING H. B. BLAVATSKY—

Students of Theosophy are noting in the current periodical and newspaper press a growing tendency to print the name of H. P. Blavatsky, attaching thereto some wholly gratuitous slander, some lying or belittling statement; and this is done in a manner which assumes that her implied baseness is a matter of common acceptance and knowledge among well informed people of the present day. Some interesting deductions can be made from this revival of a practice so common a quarter of a century ago. First, that the cycle turneth, so that an acceleration of the powerful and subtle force which vivifies the Theosophical Movement, and which reached its flood-tide near the time of the death of H. P. B. in 1891, may be expected. Second, that the spread of Theosophical ideas and the growing influence of the ancient Wisdom-religion is being severely felt by those secular and religious groups which are the bulwark of unprogressiveness and reaction.

Theosophy, the philosophy, cannot be successfully attacked. Persons associated with the name Theosophy can, however, be slandered and villified —especially if they are obligingly dead, and thus unable to protect themselves by resorting to the courts and bringing the libellers to justice. It is significant that H. P. Blavatsky is the name most often abused of late, rather than the names of her co-workers or of present day students of Theosophy. This is a recognition of Her key-position in the Movement—a most astute realization that if She can be discredited, the vitality of the teachings of Theosophy will be materially lessened. Students should be alive to the situation; well-informed both in the philosophy and in the history of the Movement and those persons and personnages most prominently related to it. They can then oppose the truth to every lie that is given circulation, instead of making mere blind denial.

THEOSOPHY is at present making every effort to supply the facts in their true relation month after month in the series, "The Theosophical Movement." Statements therein should be carefully read, thoroughly digested, and then as fully checked up as possible by every student. It is time we stopped "believing things" just because we see them in print, no matter where expressed. The more we *know,* the more conviction we have of the greatness and glory of our Cause, the greater assurance of the sublime character and nobility of the Teacher who brought us the sweet waters. Then we can speak or write to some purpose, because the conviction which comes from sincerity and knowledge will be implicit in what we say or write. And many who would otherwise be turned away by the current slanders will be helped to an understanding of the philosophy, and a recognition of the truth; furthermore not one mis-statement will pass without a refutation and rebuke.

Even among Her own close students, there were few courageous enough to defend H. P. B. during Her lifetime when She was so many times falsely and maliciously attacked; and of those few still fewer were to any considerable extent informed. The basis upon which present day attacks rest may be found in the printed writings of the traitorous, the weak, the cowardly Theosophical students of former days—those who *failed* and, failing, turned on the Teacher the bitterness of their own failure. Much evil has been done also—is being done—by those prominent in various Theosophical societies today who must belittle H. P. B. and W. Q. J. if their own vaunted "wisdom" is to be recognized and accepted by the members who follow them. Students versed in the true history of the Movement and well-grounded in Theosophy as presented by Those who brought it get at once a clear view and understanding of the position of present day "Theosophical leaders" and the value of their "teachings." But every clever tool and puppet of the vested inter-

ests of religion who can get into print lays hold of the equivocal statements of the jackdaws of Theosophy, in order to discredit a teaching, whose truth he cannot gainsay, and the true Teachers, whose natures are so far above his own that he actually sees Them upside down.

A RECENT EXAMPLE—

Last month we had occasion to correct mis-statements appearing in *The Metropolitan,* a magazine to whose columns so great a lover of truth as Theodore Roosevelt once contributed regularly, but which has now stooped to publish lying and slanderous statements about a woman long since dead and thus unable to defend herself. This month we must direct attention to *The World's Work,* which calumniated H. P. Blavatsky in a recent issue. Mr. French Strother is said to be the managing editor of the magazine named, which is publishing a translation of the diary of Sergius Witte, the widely known Russian statesman. Witte's memoirs are being "syndicated" to various newspapers in the United States by Doubleday, Page & Co., publishers of *The World's Work.* His references to H. P. B., who was a relative, are in the main defamatory. So in magazines, reviews, newspapers—publications supposedly respectable, as well as those of irresponsible character—are now being printed a series of scandalous and lying statements about Madame Blavatsky, with which enough fragments of truth are so curiously and cunningly commingled as to give them the appearance of verisimilitude and make the disentangling of truth from falsehood almost an impossibility.

To show up Witte's every mis-statement would actually require a volume: by this we mean not merely to deny them, but to gather and lay down logically, consecutively and convincingly those facts of history, philosophy and occultism that would enable any good mind to follow and understand Witte's perversions and misinterpretations of what he did actually know of his illustrious relative, as well as his suppositions, innuendos and lies about Her. H. P. B. is dead; the witnesses are for the most part dead; no complete record of Her movements or contacts is available. Nor can they, nor She herself, be understood if separated from Theosophy, the philosophy She brought, or the history and meaning of the Theosophical Movement of which She was the visible Agent in the world of men. To understand these means study, and who is willing to study these days? Not even such superhuman personages as our magazine editors!

Again, Witte was a relative—*of course* he knew all about H. P. Blavatsky and the family gossip—relatives *always* know about you! Furthermore, Witte very apparently is well acquainted with Soloviof's book, "A Modern Priestess of Isis"; and wasn't Soloviof himself a Russian, and didn't he know H. P. B., and isn't the book a complete exposure of Her and Her methods? The fact that it is a "complete exposure" of a cowardly renegade named Soloviof is seldom realized by those who read it.

According to Witte, H. P. Blavatsky was a very immoral person. She was a circus rider. She was a medium. She was a manufacturer. She was a shop-keeper. She conducted orchestras. She was a poet. She had affairs with men. She performed occult phenomena. She was several times married. She was beautiful. She was ugly. She owed her occult knowledge to the medium Home. She founded the Theosophic society. She was a self-taught concert pianist. She had extraordinary eyes. She was slovenly in Her dress. It is fascinating reading! Count Witte cannot understand Her—he writes:

> "Let him who still doubts the non-material origin and the independent existence of the soul in man consider the personality of Madame Blavatski. During her earthly existence, she housed a spirit which was,

no doubt, independent of physical or physiological being. As to the particular realm of the invisible world from which that spirit emerged, there may be some doubt whether it was inferno, purgatory or paradise. I cannot help feeling that there was something demoniac in that extraordinary woman."

But the credibility of Witte as a witness is somewhat impaired by his mis-statement of fact regarding the founding of "the Theosophic society" of which he makes England the scene, when all the world knows that its inception was in New York City in 1875, and there H. P. B. was very much heard of, before she visited England on her way to India in 1879. These gaps in Witte's Memoirs—when *facts* are available—are significant. One knowing the facts must also laugh loud and long at Witte's belief that she "owed her occult knowledge" to Home!

ABUSING A DEAD LION—

It is quite safe to kick a dead lion. It is legally safe to libel a dead person. Doubleday, Page & Co., know this. So does Mr. French Strother; so do the various publishers and editors who are printing extracts from Count Witte's memoirs. Would that H. P. B. were still living in the flesh—what a carnage! Every one of them would be made to retract and apologize—and pay! They would find that other things cost money, besides labor and mere white paper! They could never produce evidence that H. P. Blavatsky was immoral. They could never prove that She was a medium. Her whole life and writings evidence that the opposite is true. As to immorality: it is a matter of sworn record that the immorality implied by Her slanderers would have been impossible for Her—considered from a physiological point of view alone.

Is it possible that Mr. Strother, or any other of the editors or publishers who are printing Blavatsky slanders, know so little of Her history that they are uninformed as to the New York *Sun* case? That newspaper printed every scandal against Madame Blavatsky that a vindictive and clever mind could invent—many more, and much worse, than those that are now given currency. This was during Her lifetime. A libel suit was brought against the *Sun* without delay, but, whether or no, through "influence" with the courts that newspaper was able to have the case repeatedly continued, until at length nearly one year had elapsed, and H. P. Blavatsky passed away, the suit still pending. This released the liability of the *Sun* for the libel, and yet: the New York *Sun* voluntarily printed a full retraction of its charges, admitted that it had been misinformed, and at the same time printed a long article recognizing Madame Blavatsky and the noble character of Her life and work, most fair and favorable to Her teachings of Theosophy.

Do you think, Gentlemen, that if H. P. Blavatsky had been guilty of immorality and fraud, Dana's New York *Sun,* with all its ability and resource, with living witnesses available, and more than a year's time in which to prepare its case, would have taken the course it actually did take? Finding its many charges absolutely false, the *Sun* did the large and manly thing: it made full and complete retraction. Are you big enough and fair enough to admit your mistake? Or since She is dead will you evade the issue? It is quite "safe," as you know, to take the latter course.